

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the official action dated December 9, 2009. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 18-25, 28, 31, 32, 34, and 55 were pending in the application. In the official action, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 18-25, 28, 31, 32, 34, and 55 were rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 34, and 55 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 18-25, 28, 31, 32, 34, and 55 thus remain for consideration.

Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 18-25, 28, 31, 32, 34, and 55 are in condition for allowance and requests withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

**§103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18-23, 25, 32, 34, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wonfor et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,747) in view of Okuyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,126).

Claims 4, 8, 12, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wonfor in view of Okuyama and further in view of Tsutsumi (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,477).

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wonfor in view of Okuyama and further in view of Alten et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,781,246).

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wonfor in view of Okuyama and further in view of Horlander et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,953).

Applicant submits that the independent claims (claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 34, and 55) are patentable over Wonfor, Okuyama, Tsutsumi, Alten, and Horlander (collectively "the cited references").

Applicant's invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward an information processing device, an

information processing method and a computer-readable medium storing a computer program for implementing the method. The claims recite that the information processing involves identifying whether or not copy protect data is present in a program that a person wants to use or view, analyzing any such copy protect data, and controlling a display to display information regarding any such copy protect data. Each of the claims further recites that "said analyzing is based on whether the type of content included in the program is digital television content, digital audio content, or digital data content, and said analyzing is further based on the format of the content included in the program, each possible format of the content being cross-referenced to a plurality of copy control types and a plurality of digital recording control data, such that for each of digital television content, digital audio content, or digital data content there are a plurality of formats and each format of each type of content is cross-referenced to a plurality of copy control types and a plurality of digital recording control data." (Emphasis supplied.) Supporting disclosure for the quoted recitation can be found in the specification at, for example, Figs. 1-3, Fig. 1 showing the copy protect protocol for digital TV content, Fig. 2 showing the copy protect protocol for digital audio content, and Fig. 3 showing the copy protect protocol for digital data content. Each of Figs. 1-3 distinguishes between multiple formats, e.g., "1394 OUTPUT" and "NTSC\_VIDEO", and in each figure each format is cross referenced to a plurality of "copycontrol\_type" and "digital\_recordingcontrol\_data."

None of the cited references discloses the emphasized recitation. In particular, Applicant notes that Okuyama's Fig. 20 shows two types of content, video and audio, but does not show multiple formats for each type of content. Therefore, even if Okuyama's Fig. 20 is construed as disclosing the cross-

referencing of multiple content types to multiple copy control types and multiple digital recording control data, it can not possibly be construed as disclosing the cross-referencing of multiple content types to multiple copy control types and multiple digital recording control data for each of multiple formats for each content type. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 34, and 55 are patentable over the cited references - taken either individually or in combination - on at least this basis.

Further, since dependent claims inherit the limitations of their respective base claims, Applicant believes that dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18-25, 28, 31, and 32 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as discussed in connection with the independent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to telephone the undersigned at (908) 654-5000.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Dated: February 3, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Bruno  
Polito/  
Bruno Polito  
Registration No.: 38,580  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant